



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

is not finished until they have supplemented it by analyzing clearly the effects of whatever "other things" they admit as price factors.

4. What is the relative importance of the various price factors? This is the most difficult of all the questions, and the one on which the present supposed difference of opinion would be most nearly maintained. Perhaps there is little hope that substantial unity of opinion could be attained even after the most thorough and amicable discussion. But the discussion would certainly be more fruitful if both parties recognized that they were talking about the relative importance of the quantity of money as a price factor — not about its existence or nonexistence as a factor.

The confusion of ideas to which attention has been called does not appear at all in the writings of some of the participants in the controversy; and it does not prevent the other participants from dealing much of the time with points of genuine interest. But it does becloud a subject that is at best exceedingly complex, tending to divert attention from the matters of importance and to concentrate it upon a matter concerning which the disputants are unwittingly agreed. The discussion would gain much in clarity if all parties could realize that their task is not to debate the proposition that prices are affected by the quantity of money, but (1) to interpret, (2) to explain, (3) to supplement, and (4) to evaluate that proposition.

WESLEY C. MITCHELL.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

THE ECONOMIC VALUE OF THE HOME.¹

FOR the last forty years the discussion of the so-called "woman question" has been most bewildering. In order to thread one's way through it one must develop a special method of sorting out opinions according to the social rank, education, and occupations of the persons who advance arguments, must class them by the sections of the country from which those persons come — their church proclivities, political affiliations, race traditions, and personal environment — only to decide at last that no agreement is ever likely to be reached, because there are too many uncertain factors in the problem.

Mrs. Gilman's book seems destined to mark an epoch in senti-

¹ *The Home, its Work and its Influence*. By CHARLOTTE PERKINS GILMAN. New York: McClure & Philipps, 1903.

ment as to woman's place and work, because it provides a logical basis for argument. We are not now invited to a consideration of brain weights or of intrinsic differences between men and women, but to a study of the origin, growth, and present condition of an institution. The discussion is taken from *a priori* grounds and put upon evolutionary grounds.

In order to appreciate the place the book fills, let us glance hastily at the main lines of woman's recent progress. Although it was a part of the democratic movement at the end of the eighteenth century and of the New England Enlightenment of 1830-40, the "woman question" occupied no prominent place in the public mind until political issues had been fought out by the Civil War. Between 1865 and 1870 three lines of activity were begun: (1) the suffrage movement (*e. g.*, the effort made to carry woman's suffrage in Kansas in 1867); (2) the education movement, *e. g.*, the founding of Vassar College in 1865, and the opening of the University of Michigan to women in 1870); (3) the club movement (*e. g.*, the founding of the New England Woman's Club and the New York Sorosis in 1868). The first of these movements was the most abstract and has been the least successful. Although the most democratic in its purpose, it has failed, because not all women have desired suffrage. The second was perfectly democratic in intent, imperfectly so in effect, because not all women have desired higher education, and because money is required to obtain it. The strength of this movement, however, has been attested by the reactionary measures certain college presidents have felt called upon to take. The club movement has been general, and there are now more than a million club members in the United States. Women of all classes have united for a great variety of purposes—in the first years for self-culture, now almost everywhere for the improvement of society. The purpose of these organizations is activity for some definite end. The progress has been from a demand for the rights of citizenship to an assumption of its duties, from the vague to the definite, from the abstract to the concrete, from selfish to social aims.

Objections to the "emancipation of women" have come primarily from medical men, who object on the grounds of women's physical unfitness for life outside the home; in the second place, the church has always maintained a conservative attitude, based upon an interpretation of certain passages in the New Testament. Scientists are divided on the question; some biologists, as Romanes and Grant

Allen, are doubtful of any good that can come from it, while those who represent economics, sociology, and psychology are in favor of all possible development for women. Among statesmen, John Bright and Gladstone opposed the enfranchisement of women, while Bismarck favored it in a certain restricted fashion, and President Roosevelt is on record as a supporter. Educators are divided on the question. Trades unions are universally in favor of equal rights for men and women. Fears for women's emancipation have been mainly on the ground of its effects upon woman herself or upon the home. However, the statistics collected by the Association of Collegiate Alumnae as to the after-careers of college women tend to show that the influence on the race is not to be dreaded.

Public sentiment went slowly with women's progress until about 1890, then very rapidly for about ten years, when a reaction set in. It was maintained by the opposition that women's public work had shown them to be lacking in creative ability, emotional, vindictive, discontented, superficial, undemocratic, and either unprogressive or too sweeping in attempts at reform. The conservative has had his innings since about 1900. Woman's freedom has brought none of the evil effects that he predicted twenty years ago, and he has made up a different set of arguments. It was about 1885 that he was saying that business and professional life would make women masculine, but time has proved that they have not become masculine; and now he says that since sex-differences are ineradicable, training is thrown away on women. He said then that higher education would restrict marriage and motherhood; now, because a few highly educated women have abandoned their specialties for their families, they are used as illustrations of the futility of opening graduate schools to women. In other words, it appears that he has turned the good results of woman's progress so far into arguments against a continuation of opportunities for further progress.

A universal desire to be perfectly normal and healthy, as well as wealthy and wise (evidenced by the interest in athletics and perhaps partly accounting for the Christian Science movement), is characteristic of the present time. Women have become much more healthy than they were a generation ago, and the invalid is now blamed rather than pitied. The educated woman especially desires to be natural and wholesome, and not merely a specialist. The conservative takes advantage of this and asserts that only the home-maker and house-keeper is normal; the woman devoted to a cause or a specialty is a

freak. The splendid specimens of children brought into the world by the highest type of modern woman are also turned into argument against her engaging in any other kind of work than the bearing and rearing of children. The average man is engaged in the game of life — business, politics, or the professions — and has no inclination to be troubled with bringing up children; therefore, says he, this is woman's god-appointed sphere. The newly evolving type of woman, with strong individuality, is now caught in a dilemma; will she be a celibate and pursue her own life in the world, or will she marry and take on the additional problem of the home? Suppose she tries the latter. Marriage brings her serious difficulties, and in many cases, either from her own sense of duty or through the influence of someone else's sense of duty, she gives up the world and devotes herself to the home; but she is likely to be unhappy because of unsatisfied intellectual or artistic tastes. The average man, seeing her struggles, decides that it was a mistake ever to give her a taste of the outside; of course, nothing can be wrong with the home. The old idea of two separate spheres for men and women has been rejuvenated and commands the assent of many persons, both men and women, who are capable of thinking out the solution of other problems, but have given up this one. Many young women are caught in this back current of public sentiment, and believe that they must either confine themselves to their homes or remain unmarried. The movement in some cities to restrict the number of married teachers in the schools, and the fact that their wages have reached the maximum in some kinds of business, constitute external pressure upon women to choose the home, while internal pressure is always present in the form of race habits and impulses.

The most extreme ground taken by anyone in print is taken by Mrs. Marholn, who in her book, *Psychology of Woman* (1899), maintains that the whole woman's movement is pathological—a phase of economic distress; woman has not come out of the home, says Mrs. Marholn, because of inner impulse to do so or because the world needed her efforts, but because man has been compelled to shake off the parasite; under normal conditions she does not want independence. Mrs. Marholn acknowledges but one kind of productive work for women—the bearing and rearing of children. Such books as Mrs. Moody's *The Unquiet Sex* and Mrs. Johnson's *Woman and the Republic* show the strength of the reactionary movement among women themselves. The argument from the attitude

of a few women should have little more weight than the argument that the negroes did not wish to be emancipated, but it has proved a powerful barrier to the onflowing current of public opinion.

At such a time as this appears Mrs. Gilman's book, with its opening question: "Shall our home be the world or the world our home?" There is not in her mind any question of choosing the one and rejecting the other, but of broadening the one until it becomes the other.

The sum of the criticism in the following study is this: the home has not developed in proportion to our other institutions, and by its rudimentary condition it restricts development in other lines. Further, that the two main errors in the right adjustment of the home to our present life are these: the maintenance of primitive industries in a modern industrial community, and the confinement of women to those industries and their limited area of expression. No word is said against the real home, the true family life, but it is claimed that much we consider essential to that home and family life is not only unnecessary, but positively injurious. (P. 10.) To the child who longs to grow up and be free; to the restless, rebelling boy; to the girl who marries all too hastily as a means of escape; to the man who puts his neck in the collar and pulls while life lasts to meet the unceasing demands of his little sanctuary; and to the woman — the thousands upon thousands of women, who work while life lasts to serve that sanctuary by night and day — to all these it may not be unwelcome to suggest that the home need be neither a prison, a workhouse, nor a consuming fire. (P. 12.)

The book falls into three large divisions: (1) the evolution of the home; (2) the home as it is, including its activities, its elements, and its influence on those elements; and (3) lines of advance. The second division is most fully treated.

The evolution of the home is traced from the lair of the wild beast to the modern home of today — the home always bound to the past because of the presence of the aged. Home ideas make less progress than any other ideas. Blame is not placed on woman or on man, but on the human characteristic of venerating the past. "The home is an incarnate past to us." (P. 29.) This would be more forcible if explained associatively. "The cakes that mother used to make" got their taste from the hungry boy's appetite, the sacredness of the old-fashioned home from the child's fresh spirits and keen memory of the indulgence of grandfather and grandmother, and the happiness of reunions with other children at Christmas and Thanksgiving. Home ideals look backward two generations instead of forward.

One chapter on "Domestic Mythology" brings clearly to mind the fact that the home has never been studied as all other social institutions have been. No one will disagree with what is said in the chapter entitled "Present Conditions" on the ever-growing expensiveness of the home, but Mrs. Gilman does not sufficiently take into account the effort which is being made to solve this problem by educating both housekeepers and cooks—the domestic-science movement. The introduction of cooking into the public schools and the establishment of schools of domestic science may work in two ways. It is intended to simplify living and lower expenses, but it may serve to show how wasteful it is to carry on a hundred little kitchens where one would suffice, and how impossible to do such complex work thoroughly without a great food laboratory. The point of view as to food is the same as that in the author's previous book, *Woman and Economics*, and is a most brilliant exposition of the absurdity of

catering to the private appetite and thereby preventing the food system from being studied with a view to race improvement. (P. 139.) Agriculture is one of the world's great functions, and has made magnificent progress, but humaniculture has no bureau, no secretary, no experiment stations. (P. 141.) The feudal lord kept a fool to amuse him, whereas we go to the theater. He kept a cook to feed him, and we do it yet. He kept a poet to celebrate his deeds and touch his emotions. We have made poetry the highest class in literature and literature the world's widest art—by setting the poet free. . . . A private poet is necessarily ignoble. So is a private cook.

Some indications of efforts to solve this problem are very suggestive. Persons who are horrified at the idea of co-operative house-keeping are unconsciously taking steps in that direction. The growing custom of simplifying breakfasts by the use of prepared breakfast foods is becoming almost universal in the centers of civilization; lunches are taken down-town by men and business women, and at school by children; dinners still remain elaborate because of the increasing demand of cultivated people for refinement and variety in their food, and because of the extreme simplicity of the other two meals. Some small families dine at a café; others employ a servant to come in at certain hours to prepare the dinner and serve it. When it becomes customary for this servant to make the round of bakeries and delicatessen shops before she comes, and to bring with her nearly all the dinner already prepared, we shall have reached the stage for advancement that has been common in Paris for some time.

The improvement of kitchen facilities in apartments and the teaching of simpler forms of cooking in schools render the co-operation of members of the family in preparation of breakfasts and lunches an easy and often recreative labor. The sudden removal of all industries from the house would doubtless be attended with as serious consequences as the introduction of machinery. Many women would be set free from manual labor who could not find other lines of activity, and would increase the number of social parasites. It would be comfortable to believe that all women who deserve freedom from domestic drudgery are able to attain it even now, but this belief is not justified by facts.

"The Home as a Workshop" contains the same ideas as Miss Jane Addams's article "A Belated Industry,"² but is written in such a way as to reach the average man and woman, and to show how the maintenance of out-of-date industries is encroaching upon the education of the child; it also contains a *reducto ad absurdum* in the shape of a description of what the home would be like if the father had insisted on building the house, hunting and killing the game, and making the furniture all these years.

The chapter on "Domestic Entertainment" is the most keenly original in the book.

True association is impossible without common action. . . . The foundation error lies in the confinement of a social being to a purely domestic scale of living. By bringing into the home people who have no real business there, they are instantly forced into an artificial position. . . . The woman must have social contact. She cannot go where it is in the normal business of life, so she tries to drag it in where she is, forcing the social life into the domestic. (P. 202.) Given a healthy, active life of true social influence for all women, and given full accommodation of public rooms for public gatherings, and the whole thing takes care of itself. (P. 205.)

Mrs. Gilman has invented a new term, "the home-bound woman," and explains the expression "lady of the house" in a way not to be forgotten. The psychological effect of confinement in houses, as described by Mrs. Gilman is doubtless true and suggests a field for scientific investigation.

The first result is a sort of mental myopia. . . . The little-mindedness of the housewife is not a distinction of sex. It is in no essential way a feminine distinction, but merely associatively feminine in that only women are confined to houses.

² *American Journal of Sociology*, 1897.

As a work on the psychology of woman this book should be welcomed by scientists who are puzzled over the complexity and inconsistency of womankind.

Varium et mutabile! murmurs the man sagely; "a woman's privilege to change her mind!" If the nature of his industry were such that he had to change his mind from cooking to cleaning, from cleaning to sewing, from sewing to nursing, from nursing to teaching, and so, backward, forward, cross-wise and over again, from morning to night — he too would become an adept in the lightning-change act.

The man adopts one business and follows it. He develops special ability, on long lines, in connection with wide interests — and so grows broader and steadier. The distinction is there, but it is not a distinction of sex. This is why the man forgets to mail the letter. He is used to one consecutive train of thought and action. She, used to a varying, zigzag horde of little things, can readily accommodate a few more.

The home-bred brain of the woman continually puzzles and baffles the world-bred brain of the man; and from the beginning of their association it has an effect upon him. (P. 275.) The mind of the lady of the house is an arrangement of fact and feeling, which is untrue because it is disproportionate. The first tendency of the incessant home life is to exaggerate personality. The home is necessarily a hotbed of personal feeling.

The incongruity of modern education as a preparation for the old-fashioned home life is not a new topic, but previous discussions have placed the responsibility on education — not on unprogressive ideas about the home. "We charge her battery with every stimulating influence during youth and then expect her to discharge the swelling current in the same peaceful circuit which contented her great-grandmother." (P. 220.)

Many a college-bred woman has agonized in the attempt to carry on the numerous little industries that are yet in the home in as thorough a way as she had been taught to do work on her specialty in college; and has succeeded only in making them *seem* to be well done. The purpose of college training is to teach systematic thinking, thoroughness, accuracy, and the grasp of subjects, as wholes; the tendency of domestic life is to keep the home-maker from seeing anything but details, from thinking accurately, or getting to the bottom of any subject. While the knowledge of so many varied industries may be educative and broadening in its nature, it is a kind of education that should have come earlier in life. The power of concentration possible to the mature woman should be utilized in some work for the future — not in mere recapitulation of the past.

The frequent unhappiness of the aged woman is another effect of confinement in the house, and might have been added. When the children grow up and are gone, or the home must be changed, the old man has world-interests to take up; the old woman too often thinks only of the past and cannot adapt herself to new conditions.

The chapter on "Domestic Ethics" is the most radical in the book. Mrs. Gilman arranges a schedule of virtues, and goes through them to show that only love and self-sacrifice are fostered by the home, and not even the higher forms of those virtues. The home impresses the child, says Mrs. Gilman, only as a place for eating, cleaning, and making clothes. This might be investigated by the questionnaire method used so much at Clark University. If one thousand persons were asked, "What are your most prominent memories of your childhood home?" or, "What traits of character were cultivated by your home life?" and if satisfactory answers to these questions could be secured, we might have a basis for judgment. Since we have not such data, this must be a matter of opinion based on personal experience.

Those who are unconvinced by any previous chapter, cannot fail to be impressed by "Home Influence on Men." This is the chapter that most men should read first. In the introduction "the man who puts his neck in the collar and pulls while life lasts to meet the unceasing demands of his little sanctuary" appeals to the deepest sympathies of both sexes.

The best proof of man's dissatisfaction with the home is found in his universal absence from it. . . . Men work outside, play outside, and cannot rest more than so long at a time. The man maintains a home, as part of his life-area, but does not himself find room in it. This is legitimate enough. It should be equally true of the woman. No human life of our period can find full exercise in a home. (P. 283.)

Man's willingness to incur enormous household expense for what does not pay, his desire to get away from home as much as possible, and his veneration for what he does not enjoy make us feel that this "world-bred mind" is most pitifully blind in some respects. There may be hope that home ideals will change materially when another generation of college-bred women shall have brought up their sons; beside home practices are gradually changing under economic conditions. The influence of educated women may be seen in almost any division of opinion on questions of the day. The western man is more liberal toward woman's suffrage because coeducation has

shown him that woman's ability is equal to his—at least it was before it had been narrowed and superficialized by the home life. The university men who vote to give and to continue giving privileges to women are those whose mothers and wives take a share in the world's work.

In "Lines of Advance" the author enumerates many indications that the "home-bound woman that clogs the world" is rapidly becoming a thing of the past, but she does not seem to the reviewer to feel the full force of what is going on among women themselves. Much more space might be given to show concrete examples of the kinds of work that are being taken up. Many intelligent women do spend part of every day outside their homes and love them much better for it—it is only the wife of the foreign workman who takes pride in the fact that she never goes away from home.

Is the book constructive? It leaves in the mind a picture of home with all its essential qualities, without the necessity of making pretenses for the company in the parlor, or of spending most of one's precious substance on the servant in the kitchen, but surely this does not all depend upon the conservative ideals of the husband or the inertia of the wife. The mother may want the cooking done out of the house, but the family must have food, and she cannot wait until the great food laboratory is built. College women would have started these enterprises long ago if they had not been obliged to choose occupations in which they could be sure of making a living. Capital is necessary for experimentation, and public sentiment to support the enterprise. Progress waits on the doer more than on the thinker.

Mrs. Gilman's ideal of home is very nearly the actual home of a few people of artistic or literary pursuits, who have learned to entertain at the club—if at all—and to eliminate cooking from their lives as nearly as possible. However pleasing the really private home, with catering done outside, may be, it is possible only in the city. The growing tendency to leave the city earlier and earlier in the spring throws the family back upon primitive conditions for food supply in the summer. Perhaps Mrs. Gilman would say that only a small percentage go away in the summer, and that for the women a return to colonial conditions would be at least as beneficial as the lapse back into the hunting and fishing stage is to the men.

Whatever the anthropologist may say of the scholarship of the book, and in spite of numerous criticisms that may be made upon its style, the reviewer believes that it will be of great value in clarifying

opinion on the whole subject of woman's work in the world and her preparation for it, and indirectly upon other problems of the time.

For example, the general problem of education halts in the same phase as the problem of woman's education — between the question of general culture and of adaptation to some particular career. Shall woman be educated for the world or for the one career of home-making? The solution is easier if the world is looked upon as the home. The question is a particularly difficult one because women are always looked upon as a distinct class of beings — more distinct than men of any race or condition. The sentiment of the present day is not so conservative as to say that the home should be woman's entire world, but certainly men do not look upon women as citizens in at all the same sense that any other men may be citizens. The educational revolution of the last quarter of a century has consisted of a series of democratizing movements. The founding of schools for Indians and negroes, of colleges for women, of agricultural and scientific schools, of institutions for technical and commercial education, and of schools for domestic science, have all tended to put the power which knowledge gives into the hands of special classes of the people; while the library movement, university extension, compulsory education, summer schools, and physical and industrial training in the public schools have opened doors to all classes. The problem of adaptation of education to a given environment has been better worked out at Tuskegee than in any other school in the United States, but Abbotsholme, Ilsenburg, and the Chicago School of Education are all trying to work out a more complex problem in a more developed civilization.

Democracy itself has again become a problem in the last twenty-five years. The above-mentioned reaction in sentiment as to women's progress is a part of this wave of doubt as to the possibility of maintaining democratic institutions. As the simple frontier community has given place to one that is complex, differentiated, and full of a variety of conflicting interests, the problem has become that of adjustment of relations between classes. Education and representation are the two influences relied upon to keep American society from reaching the Old-World stage. Women have shared in all the democratic movements, educational, social, and political, but it has always been tacitly understood that they were hopelessly out of reach of direct participation in certain democratic privileges. There is a good deal of feeling that the whole subject of suffrage should be

put upon a new basis, but the class feeling against women is still stronger than against any class of men. Mrs. Stetson would, of course, trace this to undemocratic home relations—to the economic dependence of women and their isolation in their work.

Whatever the prejudices of the reader may be, if he has at all a scientific attitude of mind, he will desire to see a great food laboratory endowed—that “humaniculture” may be provided with a bureau and experiment stations.

CAROLINE M. HILL.